

Clinical Trials Management Systems Workspace
Face-to-Face Meeting
Oregon Health & Science University
SESSION: Enterprise Support Network

Session Information	Date: May 31, 2007 Time: 2:00 p.m.–3:00 p.m. PDT Presenter/Lead: Leslie Derr Facilitator: Julie Holtzople Scribe: Daniela Smith
Executive Summary	<p>Leslie Derr delivered a presentation on the caBIG™ Enterprise Support Network, intended to furnish support for caBIG™ tool adoption as part of the Enterprise program. Participants discussed in detail the service provider process and funding questions. Participants also agreed on the need for automated feedback mechanisms to promote efficient tool development/enhancement.</p>
Discussion	<p>Key Discussion Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Is the Service Provider Program different for every tool or hierarchical structure, and is there a fee per hour? <p>A: Each provider will negotiate a contract schedule based on responses to Requests for Information (RFI). It is the responsibility of the institution to negotiate contract for fees, etc. With Enterprise Adoption, there is no exchange of money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Service Provider program is intended to support help in installation. If an institution wants to adopt a suite of tools, that institution should apply, and, given that it is accepted, the service providers will work to ensure integration with their workflow. They will not give direct funds, but will work with the institution to make the adoption process most effective. This program should accommodate various business models. • Pilot adoptions served as a learning process to collect information. • Requests for Proposals (RFP) for Knowledge Centers will be distributed in June 2007, followed by RFPs for Program Offices. • The Enterprise Adopter Program is currently open for Tissue Banks tools only and will eventually be used for Clinical Trial Management Systems (CTMS) tools. It is possible that the program will fall away completely as more is learned about service integration. • Q: Is there an automatic feedback database that collects user feedback as tools are rolled out? <p>A: Feedback is received as adopters use the tools. Each of the different developers uses an electronic infrastructure to manage input from users on an ongoing basis. This input is usually bug reports or feature requests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matching (i.e., resources) between different institutions should be accomplished through a user group receiving feedback in the traditional manner and building an automatic structure or database.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Developing an automated FAQ repository would be helpful to communicate the goals and structure of the Enterprise Support Network and would ensure that the Documentation & Training arm of caBIG™ is in concert with development. Tools could then be updated more efficiently. This FAQ repository would need to be monitored and managed.There is a risk to the caBIG™ program with the Enterprise Adopter program that leaves caBIG™ open to disparagement by users. It should be determined to what extent users can electronically and publicly log any remark on the program.			
Requirements				
	Req. #	Name	Description	
	Enterprise Support – R1	User Group Feedback	Matching (i.e. resources) between different institutions should be accomplished through a user group receiving feedback in the traditional manner and building an automatic structure or database.	
	Enterprise Support – R2	Automated FAQ Development	Developing an automated FAQ repository would be helpful to communicate the goals and structure of the Enterprise Support Network and would ensure that the Documentation & Training arm of caBIG™ is in concert with development.	
Issues				
	Issue ID	Description		
	Enterprise Support – I1	There is a risk to the caBIG™ program with the Enterprise Adopter program that leaves caBIG™ open to disparagement by users. It should be determined to what extent users can electronically and publicly log any remark on the program.		
Action Items	No action items were identified during this session.			
Attendance				
	#	First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
	1.	Elaine	Brock	Univ. of Michigan
	2.	Amar	Chahal	Velos, Inc.
	3.	Deborah	Collyar	PAIR
	4.	Don	Connelly	Univ. of Minnesota
	5.	Paul	Courtney	Dartmouth
	6.	Peter	Covitz	NCI CBIIT
	7.	Mary Jo	Deering	NCI CBIIT
	8.	Leslie	Derr	NCI CBIIT
	9.	Lara	Fournier	OHSU
	10.	Julie	Holtzople	Booz Allen Hamilton
	11.	David	Loose	BLC
	12.	Joyce	Niland	City of Hope

	13.	Rachel	Nosowsky	Univ. of Michigan
	14.	Susan	Pannoni	City of Hope
	15.	Kerri	Phillips	PercipEnz
	16.	Diane	Rickman	Booz Allen Hamilton
	17.	Daniela	Smith	Booz Allen Hamilton
	18.	John	Speakman	NCI CBIIT
	19.	Umit	Topaloglu	Univ. of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
	20.	Susan	Varghese	Booz Allen Hamilton